

Technical review report (20%)								
Category	Fail	Marginal fail	Pass	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent (High)	Excellent (Outstanding)
	0-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79%	80-89	90-100
Context & limitations (2%)	The presented work is of very little relevance, if any, to the subject in question. It is incomplete or inadequate in every respect. A blank answer must be awarded zero.	Insufficient understanding demonstrated. Important key concepts may be omitted, inaccurate or poorly expressed.	Context and applications difficult to understand. There may be some important gaps in understanding and/or detail lacking in explaining key concepts and ideas.	Understands the context but does not have a firm grasp and depth of understanding of all the key concepts. Any inaccuracies are minor.	Very good understanding of the need for the context and applications. Shows a firm grasp of the the main challenges and limitaions	Effective and systematic context and limitations to research area that provides a sound base for the review.	Demonstrates extra depth and academic maturity providing a very systematic and critical context and limitations to the research area.	Outstanding work. The work is well beyond that expected at this level of study
Technical content (6%)	Incoherent	Some attempt, but no valid information or technical discussion has been presented	Some information from the given documentation has been included	Good summary of the given documentation	Very good understanding of the given documentation, with given examples of methodologies and technical fundamentals	Excellent analysis of the methodology, including current novelties and approaches with technical fundamentals	Outstanding work, thorough analysis of different methodologies and creative guidelines for further development provided	Outstanding work. The work is well beyond that expected at this level of study
Understandig and Analysis (10%)	Little or no understanding	Inadequate analysis and understanding	Limited or lacking arguments and understanding may be weak (e.g. lack logical development) or lack clarity. Unable to demonstrate theoretical basis	Critical understanding of the analysis and evaluation is limited, although some relevant points are included.	Shows initiative, the ability to think clearly, critically evaluate ideas. Very good understanding of the theoretical basis. Accounts properly for expected outcomes.	Logical and rigorous approach taken to critically evaluate and integrate ideas with solid understanding. Deals confidently with the complexities and subtleties of key issues.	Demonstrates significant personal insight/ creativity/original ty in evaluating and interpreting the understanding of the work.	Outstanding work. The work is well beyond that expected at this level of study
Structure and presentation (2%)	The presented work is of very little relevance, if any, to the subject in question. It is incomplete or inadequate in every respect. A blank answer must be awarded zero.	Report is incoherent or has poor structure and/or the overall standard of presentation may be poor.	Required components present in recognisable form. Possible to see what has been done from the paper. Structure needs improvement, e.g. lacks clarity	Reasonably clear and coherent, generally presenting ideas and information in a logical way	Clear and coherent structure showing logical and ordered thought. Generally professional, although may have some minor flaws. Figures and tables are generally wellconstructed and accurate.	The paper is coherent, follows the guidance given strictly, well structured, easy to read, and few corrections are required. It gives a very clear account of the work that has been done. Figures and tables are well-constructed and accurate.	Truly professional piece of work, typically with an absence of errors	Faultless

Technical simulation report (20%)

Category	Fail	Marginal fail	Pass	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent (High)	Excellent (Outstanding)
	0-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79%	80-89	90-100
Execution of the work (10%)	Little or no work carried out.	Some attempt at work, but no valid results.	Some appropriate computational work and analysis, but poor results.	Effective work. Some success but reliability uncertain and little attempt to account for errors.	Work is well planned, strcutred, carried out carefully and fully documented. Results reliability is discussed adequately.	Excellent work, and rigorous comparison and discussion made.	Outstanding work Every reasonable step taken to verify the results, and a thorough error analysis has been completed.	Outstanding work. The work is well beyond that expected at this level of study
Understanding, Analysis and critique (8%)	Little or no understanding.	Poor and inadequate analysis. Little understanding. Cannot relate any of the work to theory.	Shows superficial understanding. Unable to demonstrate theoretical basis for work. Almost no attempt to analyse results.	Shows some understanding. Theory applied but little evidence for firm grasp of key concepts. Limited critical analysis.	Shows a firm grasp of the subject and current theory but there may be gaps. Can critically evaluate results and ideas.	Thorough understanding of the subject and shows evidence of serious critical evaluation of results.	Deep and comprehensive understanding of the subject. Critique adds significant value to the results.	Outstanding work. The work is well beyond that expected at this level of study
Structure and presentation (2%)	The presented work is of very little relevance, if any, to the subject in question. It is incomplete or inadequate in every respect. A blank answer must be awarded zero.	Report is incoherent or has poor structure and/or the overall standard of presentation may be poor.	Required components present in recognisable form. Possible to see what has been done from the paper. Structure needs improvement, e.g. lacks clarity	Reasonably clear and coherent, generally presenting ideas and information in a logical way	Clear and coherent structure showing logical and ordered thought. Generally professional, although may have some minor flaws. Figures and tables are generally wellconstructed and accurate.	The paper is coherent, follows the guidance given strictly, well structured, easy to read, and few corrections are required. It gives a very clear account of the work that has been done. Figures and tables are well-constructed and accurate.	Truly professional piece of work, typically with an absence of errors	Faultless